



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,061	02/05/2001	Nicholas J. Elsey	41698-1005	2496

7590 05/07/2004
Alex L. Yip
Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays & Handler, LLP
425 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2645

5

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/777,061

Applicant(s)

ELSEY ET AL.

Examiner

Ming Chow

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 43-52 and 88-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 43-52 and 88-97 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2645

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 43-52 and 88-97 in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because proper legends were missing. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2645

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 43-47, 49-52, 88-92, 94-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho (US: 6597777).

For claims 43, 45, 88, 90, Ho teaches on Fig. 6 interface between network and sample processor (claimed “interface”) for receiving communication event records. Ho teaches on column 4 line 33-42 record identifiers. Ho teaches on column 10 line 6-9 sampler processor (claimed “processor”) processes transaction data for each service class (reads on claimed “associating records with the communication”). Ho teaches on column 4 line 6-8 and item 606 Fig. 8 statistics displayed on the GUI.

Regarding claims 44, 89, Ho teaches on column 1 line 49-65 credit card transactions and health-card transactions are the claimed “information assistance call”.

Art Unit: 2645

Regarding claims 46, 91, Ho teaches on column 4 line 65 weekday basis (claimed “time when the communication takes place”).

Regarding claims 47, 92, Ho teaches on column 4 line 64-65 consistent duration (claimed “interval”).

Regarding claims 49, 94, Ho teach on Fig. 1 the communication is transported through AT&T (claimed “carrier”). The statistics taught by Ho is for the carrier (AT&T).

Regarding claims 50, 95, Ho teaches on column 1 line 49-65 VISA and MasterCard credit card transactions (claimed “market”).

Regarding claims 51, 96, Ho teaches on column 1 line 49-65 multiple service classes (claimed “type of event”).

Regarding claims 52, 97, Ho teaches on Fig. 2A-2G, Fig. 3, Fig. 4A-4G, Fig. 5A-5C, statistics generated based on the data represented by the record indicating the selected events.

Art Unit: 2645

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 48, 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho as applied to claim 43 above, and in view of Morrison et al (US: 5623540). Ho failed to teach “the communication.....call center”. However, Morrison et al teach on column 4 line 9-10 and column 3 line 7-8 telephone call statistics from one or more CBXs (claimed “call center”) which may be at different locations. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Ho to have the “the communication.....call center” as taught by Morrison et al such that the modified system of Ho would be able to support the statistics based on a location of call center to the system users.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2645

- Bertoglio et al (US: 4165447) teach centralized-data registration equipment for traffic supervision in telecommunication system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703) 305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to Central FAX Number 703-872-9306.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

